

1963

in both Japan and the United States have developed exchange agreements in these areas which are functioning smoothly, which are productive and which hold great promise for the future.

In terms of numbers of sets and the percentage of population covered by them, the United States and Japan are the two largest television nations in the world. I think it is entirely fitting that we should share our programs, our personnel, and our expertise. Moreover, the impact of these programs is bound to be wholly constructive. In the history of Japanese-American relations perhaps no other exchange will, in the long run, contribute as much towards bringing about the mutual understanding and respect of our peoples.

As I see it, the challenge of this conference is to point the way toward overcoming the obstacles to a comparable exchange in the educational television field. There are obvious reasons for these problems, and it is just as obvious that this conference will be helpful in solving them.

One of the basic problems from the point of view of the United States is that educational television here is just getting organized. It is plagued and frustrated by serious growing pains—lack of programming and lack of financial support, for example. These problems undoubtedly have partly accounted for the shortage of educational programming suitable for export, and also for the lack of information on what is available. Other factors, perhaps, account for the same dilemma in Japan. But in both cases we know that educational television programming has been available for export, and also that no significant exchange of programming has taken place. The obstacles which have prevented this exchange will continue to do so unless they are identified and eliminated. Interestingly, both the Japanese study group and the American study group identified almost exactly the same roadblocks. And interestingly also, in no case do any of these present any impediment to the exchange of commercial television between our two nations.

To expedite the deliberations of this conference I have been asked to "list and describe the obstacles to exchange" and then to "make succinct recommendations that will be meaningful to the delegates * * * and to those able to act upon these recommendations." In my attempt to do so I hope that the distinguished delegates will not hesitate to criticize any suggestions I might offer. Only through free and uninhibited exchange of opinion are we likely to find the answers to the problems confronting us.

1. Both study groups suggest the establishment of a permanent clearinghouse in each country whose function would be to focus on educational television exchange problems. The clearinghouses would be assigned the tasks of overcoming existing obstacles to educational television exchange in their respective countries and to promoting greater exchange. They would, for example, prepare a catalog of available educational television programming, assist in the development of personnel exchange programs, and provide translation and research services; and they would, of course, maintain close liaison with each other.

Recommendation: This threshold recommendation appears eminently sound and I urge this Conference to agree in principle that each of the two nations establish such a clearinghouse. The organization and financing of the two agencies should rest, of course, entirely with the broadcasters of each country and not with this Conference. As a matter of information to both delegations, however, I recommend to the American delegation that it request National Educational Television to organize, staff, and operate, under its auspices, the U.S. clearinghouse.

2. Both study groups also identified the following as serious problems:

A. Lack of knowledge of educational television programs available in Japan for broadcast in the United States and vice versa;

B. The complexity of custom regulations and brokerage arrangements;

C. The complexity of copyright clearance procedures;

D. The cost of dubbing and substituting;

E. The lack of information on Japanese and American audience reaction, particularly school audiences; and

F. The shortage of translations of papers bearing on technical and research problems.

Recommendation: None of these problems—as difficult as they may appear—is insurmountable. They have all been faced and, generally speaking, satisfactorily solved by commercial broadcasters. It is recommended that they be surveyed in Japan and in the United States by groups commissioned by the respective clearinghouses. These groups should be composed of individuals representing both public and private organizations which have responsibilities in the specific problem areas. In the United States, for example, such organizations as the National Association of Broadcasters, the Television Program Export Association, the Customs Bureau, the several television programming exporters, the National Education Association, educational foundations and other groups would, I am confident, be most willing to bring their experience and competence to bear upon the existing obstacles to a greater and more productive program exchange.

Thank you for your considerate attention.

Vietnam file
Independence Day of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on October 26 the Republic of Vietnam will celebrate the ninth anniversary of her independence. On this auspicious occasion, we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Ngo Dinh Diem; and His Excellency the Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, Do Vang Ly.

At the Geneva Conference in the summer of 1954 Vietnam was partitioned along the 17th parallel. At that time, Western observers gave South Vietnam almost no chance of withstanding the challenge of Communist North Vietnam. I think it is worthwhile remembering this fact at a time when our thoughts on South Vietnam are filled with doubts and apprehension.

The situation that faced South Vietnam after the Geneva Conference was filled with many difficulties. The years of war had destroyed almost all transportation and communication, and the economy of the country had come to a virtual standstill. Political power was in the grip of the armed Cao Dai and Hoa Hao religious sects, the Binh Xuyen crime syndicate, and a number of other organized groups intent upon obstructing the development of a strong govern-

ment at Saigon. There was the national army, but the soldiers were demoralized by recent military defeat and the very loyalty of the army was uncertain. Another major problem was the influx of more than 800,000 destitute refugees who had abandoned all they possessed in the north and fled southward from communism. On the credit side, South Vietnam's important assets were the firm leadership of Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, the patriotism of the Vietnamese people, and the backing of the United States.

The independence of South Vietnam was officially proclaimed on October 26, 1954, but this event did not really alter the anticipation of a Communist takeover. It was considered only a question of time before the unstable south fell into the clutches of the Communists of North Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, it happens that South Vietnam will celebrate the ninth anniversary of its independence. It means that for almost a decade now the Government and people of South Vietnam have been solving many of the problems that once threatened to destroy the country. Above all, it means that they have been successfully resisting the Communist attempts at aggression and subversion. It has been a long and terrible struggle, with a heavy toll in ravaged crops, confiscated livestock, burned homes, misery and death.

Since the Communists opened their all-out attack on South Vietnam, our country has increased both military and economic assistance and has repeatedly stated its determination to help the Vietnamese defend themselves. The United States sees the Communist attempt to conquer South Vietnam as a threat to our own security, because a Communist victory there might lead many people to believe that communism is in fact the wave of the future. The defeat of South Vietnam would increase the difficulty of defending the rest of southeast Asia and place in jeopardy the independent development of all free Asian countries.

The people of South Vietnam and their government have fought bravely against Communist aggression and subversion, and they have shown the world again that it is possible to stand up to the forces of communism. There are few people in the world today who have had to fight so steadfastly to preserve their freedom and independence as those who live in South Vietnam. They deserve our admiration, and I take this opportunity to salute them on the anniversary of their country's independence.

H. M. Baggarly, Outstanding Editor,
Writes of Current Problems in Our
Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, H. M. Baggarly, famous Texas editor of

A6632

October 24

the *Tulsa Herald*, has written a discerning column discussing a facet of news management which is most interesting. Mr. Baggarly, whose newspaper writings have won him numerous awards, and who perhaps is the most quoted member of his profession by other Texas editors, presents here a column deserving of the most careful study. I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "The Country Editor" by this distinguished, award-winning Texas newsmen from the Thursday, October 10, 1963, edition of the *Tulsa Herald* be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(By H. M. Baggarly)

A vice president of the National Broadcasting Co., in our office recently, voiced alarm and almost cynicism as we discussed the "managed news" which is dispensed by the big dailies and their radio and TV voices. But he believes the readers are as much to blame as are publishers with axes to grind.

The public seldom if ever demands "both sides of the story" from a newspaper or radio-TV network. It only demands the side it wants to hear, ammunition for its cause.

It is alarming to learn that most of the mail to news dispensing agencies isn't a request for knowledge and information—it is a demand that news be withheld, that a commentator be put off the air, that a columnist be dropped from a paper.

Is this the American way?

Is it American to demand that a radio station drop a religious broadcast of another faith? Is it American to demand that men of the stature of Chet Huntley be dropped from a television network? Is it American to threaten to withhold patronage from a merchant in an effort to get that merchant to withhold advertising from a news medium that carries columnists or commentators one doesn't like?

In a democracy, expression of opinion should never be curbed. As much as we would like to do something about the dissemination of false information and slanted news, still this isn't advisable since in our efforts to dig out a few weeds, we will inadvertently dig up some of the flowers too.

Americans must understand that this sword is two-edged. Things have a way of backfiring. If we pass a law to discriminate against the Catholics, then that same law may be used to discriminate against Protestants next week. If we seek to ban an unpopular and minority religious sect today, that precedent may be used to ban our own religion tomorrow. The noose we weave to hang our enemy may be used to hang ourselves.

If we demand Protestant religious exercises in our schools today, tomorrow the required exercises may be Catholic. If we want a newspaper column deleted because we don't agree with its author, that same precedent may be used to delete our favorite column next time.

Human nature never changes, whether a person is 8 or 80. The 8-year-old school boy would like to have a 12-month vacation each year and no school. He would like to have all dessert and no vegetables.

The young housewife would like to have lots of time for club work and bridge parties and a minimum of housework and dish washing.

The conservative businessman would like to have good business, high profits, low wages to pay, and low taxes.

Man wants to have his cake and eat it too. What he never seems to learn is that we can't divorce high business profits from a pro-

perous working force. Business prosperity and mass unemployment can't coexist.

Big business leaders, plagued with wage problems, often eye automation with a far-away look. They long for the day they can turn labor out to pasture and replace it with machines. This is a reasonable reaction if we prefer to look no farther than the end of our noses. But the only catch is this, with labor on relief, who is going to buy what the merchant has to sell? We haven't heard of many shopping booms where laborers attempt to live off \$25 a week unemployment checks.

As much as we would like to have high sales and low overhead, such a situation cannot be had.

There is also a connection, indirect if not direct, between high taxes and prosperity. That is to say that if the factors which brought about high taxes had been bypassed or evaded, not faced, then we might not be enjoying the prosperity which is ours today.

For example, had the administrations of the past 30 years ignored the agricultural problem, refused to consider any kind of an agricultural program, we might have saved a few tax dollars, but in saving these tax dollars, what would have happened to the farmer?

As we have pointed out more than once, what counts isn't our gross pay, our taxes, the size of our paycheck. It means nothing to compare the number of dollars we earned in 1933 with the number we earned in 1963. It means nothing to compare the taxes we paid in 1933 with those paid in 1963.

The only thing that counts is the relative buying power of these dollars that are left after taxes which we call our standard of living.

The fact is, the dollars we have left in 1963 are providing us the highest standard of living any nation has enjoyed in the history of the world. And from an economic standpoint, that is the only thing that counts.

But we'll always have those dear souls who want 1963 income and 1933 taxes, who want what they call a dollar worth a dollar and not 59 cents but they want that dollar in the quantity that dollars are available in 1963, not in 1933. We'll always have those precious souls who want their cake and eat it too, who want to dance without paying the piper.

And a few of these souls would like to have a price for their grain which only an effective Government-farm program could guarantee, but raise this grain in unlimited quantities.

How any American could justify attempts in a democracy to deliberately discourage large numbers of our citizens from voting is difficult to understand. These efforts to preserve Government by minority smack of medieval Europe when the prevailing philosophy was that the masses are incapable of governing themselves. They must instead have the "sound and conservative" leadership of the handful of uncommon men.

This philosophy sprang up in this country from the very beginning. It was in America that politicians advocated that only landowners be allowed to vote. It was in America that a Dallas billionaire suggested that a man should be given not one but a number of votes, the number to be determined by his wealth. (Since that man is a member of the First Baptist Church in Dallas, we wonder why he doesn't advocate the same principle in determining church policy. For instance, if a pastor was to be called, Brother Hunt could have perhaps 100 votes, while the dollar-a-Sunday student would get only 1 vote. Or if the church wanted to vote on integration of its membership, something Brother Hunt vigorously opposes, he could say "no" a hundred times instead of just once.)

It is admitted that some people are better qualified to cast a vote than others, but

these qualifications are not necessarily based on whether or not one has paid a poll tax. We know political illiterates who never fail to pay a poll tax and vote. And we know intelligent citizens whose chief sin is inability to support a family of five on \$60 a week. With grocery bills, doctors bills, hospital bills, and a hundred other bills all staring them in the face, they pass up that \$3.50 poll tax which seems to be the only bill they can dodge.

But with all its alleged drawbacks, we have yet to find a better way to govern ourselves than rule by the majority.

Of course we seldom hear any complaint of so-called bloc voting unless the bloc votes against us. So it is that no votes are "dirty" unless they aren't ours.

H.R. 333, a Bill To Lift Antitrust Immunities From Labor Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a good deal of mail lately concerning H.R. 333, a bill which amends the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Norris-LaGuardia Act, and Taft-Hartley Act so as to lift antitrust immunities from labor organizations. By far the great majority of these letters have been in support of this bill. Yet I have received other letters which condemn this bill and similar attempts to curb union monopoly power. These letters reveal certain misconceptions about the nature and effect of my bill.

First of all, my bill would not eliminate health and welfare benefits or pension plans. International unions and brotherhoods could continue to administer such plans, providing, of course, that these benefits could not be withheld as a lever to regain control of collective bargaining activities. If the large national and international unions did not see fit to continue these benefit and pension plans, they could be taken over and administered by the local unions on the basis of contributions received from local members. All benefit, pension, and strike funds must come ultimately from the local union member anyway, and if these contributions went no further than the local union, there is less likelihood that they would be diverted to pay for marble palaces in Washington and black Cadillacs for union leaders.

By the same token, sick leave pay, vacation pay, and overtime pay would not be eliminated. These and other issues would be negotiated by the unions with each individual company, neither having an unfair advantage in size or power over the other.

It is further charged that H.R. 333 would destroy craft unions, replacing them by industrial unions. This is not true. The Landrum-Griffin Act specifically states:

It shall not be an unfair labor practice under subsections (a) and (b) of this section